

Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina Round 7 Part 21

Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina

Round VII -21

[Back](#) < > [Next](#)

Edip Yuksel writes in colored boxes

Ali Sina in blank page

You fell for it, Ali Sina. Indeed, on your face. I posted that article to provoke you to make such an attack; a knee-jerk attack. You demonstrated that I did not underestimate your "mistunderestimation". Let me explain and offer you first-aid:

Dear Edip.

You wrote a book quoting all those details about the life of Muhammad and you say that was a trap for me? In that case this trap probably was misplaced because it looked like you fell on it yourself.

Now identify all those extraneous information that do not exist in the Quran, and take them out of my article, and you will see that nothing would be lost regarding my claims and arguments about the last prophet's character, mission and message. If I do the same thing to your previous claims and arguments about Muhammad's character, mission and message, nothing would stand. That is a big difference. How could I have accomplished something like this? What are you missing so that you are confusing knick with knack? Why you are not able to distinguish the hay from grain? Discard the eyeglass of hatred and fanaticism and this simple issue will become as clear as Tucson's sky.

Let me put in other words so that some of your fans too will understand: Replace 570 with any other date, or replace Mecca with any other city name, or even replace Muhammad's name with any other name. Yes, not a single personal, moral, and legal principle advocated in my article would change or lose its Quranic foundation and truth-value.

As for your assertion that I could not have known that Abraham was a legendary ancestor of Jews and Arabs from any other source besides Bible and Hadith. Well, somehow you forgot the Quran, as you cunningly and frequently do so. See The Quran: 2:132; 22:78...

You still do not get it, dear Ali. You use THE STINKIEST SUBSTANCE out of the Sunni holy trash as the MAIN MENUE in your round table. As for me, I arguably picked some material too from the same can; but they were CLEAN PLASTICS; I used them as ORNAMENTAL or STYLISTIC COSMETICS on my round table. I can easily trash them if my guests dislike their color, as I did it right now; but if you discard those stinky items from your table, you and your beloved friends will starve to death. Do you smell and see the difference dear Ali? Do you understand metaphors? I bet you do. But, you may act as if you do not understand or hear me.

Perhaps you are still confusing me with some of your Hislamic opponents. Or, you are praying that I would just devolve to one of them so you could pull my beard smack my medieval head with those volumes of holy trash! Bad luck! When I say the Quran is sufficient, I say it within the context of the Quran's mission, which is to guide us to eternal salvation. When I say the Quran is sufficient, I do not mean that I do not need or enjoy salt or pepper for my food, car for my transportation, plastic for wrapping, or other sources of information. I do not mean that. I simply mean that anyone who follows the instructions and principles of the Quran ALONE will be guided to the straight path and will attain eternal salvation. I do also believe that people do not need even to know the Quran to free them from the hypnosis of devil by submitting themselves to God--who is the Truth, lead a righteous life and believe in the Day of Judgment (2:62).

None needs to know the birth year or place of Muhammad, nor the name of his enemies, etc, to be a muslim, that is, submitter to God alone and promoter of peace; they are trivial information. Even if those information were wrong, it would not change any tenet of my faith or practice. Are you following me?

The birth year of Muhammad has no substantial contribution to my argument, but your arguments are based on dubious sources with numerous contradictions and ridiculous stories. Besides, reasonable people--not fanatic skeptics or evilgelicals--would easily

concede that there is no a reasonable and actual motive behind distorting the birth year of Muhammad, but there are many reasons and motives to fabricate lies about Muhammad's personal life, about his treatment of women, or his treatment of a tribe banished from Medina because of their betrayal during a war of self-defense. There are plenty of motives for those who reverted to the days of ignorance and established kingdoms in the name of God to distort the original message to justify their corrupt acts in public.

The message of Islam is not self evident. For example Daoism is self evident, because Dao is the natural way – the way things are, the way things happen. You don't have to be indoctrinated to understand Dao. All you need to do is to observe and see how winds blow, how sun rises and sets, how rain falls, how flowers blossom, how children learn to smile, how people get sick and die, etc. Anyone can discover the Dao on his/her own. You may need a coach but not indoctrination. Islam, like all other monotheistic religions is not that way. It has a set of rules and principles that you on your own can't know unless someone tells you. This is precisely the role of the messenger. He is allegedly the one who brings a message to mankind and unless you don't follow his instructions you can't know the right way or what God wants from you. That is not the case with Daoism where there are no messengers and you are basically a guide unto your own. So, you don't have to know anything about Lao Zi, Zhuang Zi or any of the masters of Dao to become a master yourself. Daoism is an art of living. Just like music, you can become a master musician without ever having heard of Mozart or Beethoven.

Islam is not that way. You can't master Islam if you don't know what the Quran says. Despite the comical claim of its adherents who say everyone is born Muslim, Islam does not come natural to us. We must be indoctrinated in it. The very concept of monotheism is not natural to humans. It is indoctrination and conditioning. Although for Muslims, born and brainwashed since infancy in Islam, monotheism seems to be the most logical and self-evident fact, it really is not. Many people are not theists and many of them are polytheists. The concept of monotheism is relatively new and it dates back to Akhenaton, a pharaoh who lived in 14th Century BC.

The very fact that monotheist religions are prophet based, is proof that they are not natural or self evident. You must believe in those prophets and follow their teachings and you are not allowed to change an iota of what they say. This is not the case with natural "religions". For example in Buddhism you are encouraged to question anything. You must love more the art than the teacher. The motto of Buddhism is: "if you meet Buddha, kill him".